UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,449	07/21/2003	Timothy Hamlett	56243.000007	5238

21967 7590 03/08/2005

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER	
VU, KIEU D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,449	HAMLETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kieu D Vu	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. It is requested that the Application be updated with the Patent No. of parent application cited in page 1.

2. The abstract is objected since it has more than 150 words.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Objections

3. It appears that each of claims 6 and 17 contains a typographical error. "the user" should be rewritten as "a user".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claim recites "signal embodied in at least one carrier wave". As such, the claim directs to an intangible medium which renders the claim non-statutory.

It is noted that the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a **practical application**. That is, it must produce a **"useful, concrete and tangible result."** *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. MPEP 2106.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-6, 8-17, and 19-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Jr. et al (US Pat. No. 6,057,854) and Prieto (US Pat. No. 5,974,181).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 23, 24, and 25, David, Jr. teaches steps for implementing a browser object container comprising identifying content data for inclusion in a browser object container (data to render an image) (col 1, lines 45-51), defining one or more navigation options for defining how one or more recipients view the content data as provided by the browser object container (col 1, lines 52-62); adding the content data with the one or more navigation options to the browser object container wherein the content data and the one or more navigation options are embedded into a content definition (line 66 of col 1 to line 10 of col 2). David Jr. further teaches electronically transmitting the browser object container to the one or more recipients wherein the one or more recipients navigate through the content data as allowed by the one or more navigation options within the browser object container (col 3, lines 56-57).

Davis, Jr. differs from the claims in that Davis, Jr. does not teach encrypting and compressing the content file. However, such processes are well known in the art as evidenced by Prieto. Specifically, Prieto teaches encrypting and compressing vector image data (figures 2 & 6, col. 3, line 61 to col. 4, line 39 and col. 5, lines 37-61). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Prieto's teaching encrypting and compressing in Davis, Jr.'s imaging system with the motivation being to enhance the security when transferring data over the Internet.

Regarding claims 2 and 13, Davis, Jr. teaches that the content data comprises web pages (web page 28), picture files (graphics file) (col 4, lines 47-52).

Regarding claims 3 and 14, David, Jr. teaches that the content data is transmitted via network computer (col 4, lines 17-20).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, David, Jr. teaches the browser object container is a stand-alone executable operating locally but giving an appearance of being connected to the Internet (data downloaded).

Regarding claims 5 and 16, David, Jr. teaches wherein the content data comprises a plurality of web pages from one or more web sites (col 2, lines 26-29).

Regarding claims 6 and 17, David, Jr. teaches a browser interface of the browser object container is defined by the user (col 8, lines 28-40).

Regarding claims 8 and 19, Prieto teaches decrypting the encrypted file and decompressing the compressed file (figure 10 and 14).

Regarding claims 9 and 20, David, Jr. teaches the content data comprises a plurality of embedded data files (col 4, lines 47-52).

Regarding claims 10 and 21, David, Jr. teaches the embedded data files comprises an entire website (col 4, lines 47-52).

Regarding claims 11 and 22, David, Jr. teaches enabling recipients to access web pages available on the Internet without an Internet connection (objects may be downloaded and cached) (col 2, lines 26-29).

8. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis, Jr., Prieto, and Halstead et al ("Halstead", USP 6363392).

Regarding claims 7 and 18, Davis, Jr. and Prieto do not teach assigning multiple levels of encryption to content data for enabling multiple levels of access to the one or more recipients. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Halstead. Halstead teaches system for providing a web-shareable personal database which comprises password security module to provide multiple privilege levels to access data (col 15, lines 5-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Davis, Jr., Prieto, and Halstead before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface system taught by Davis, Jr. and Prieto to include providing multiple privilege levels to access data taught by Halstead with the motivation being to further enhance the security for the system (Halstead, col 15, lines 5-8).

9. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach transmitting data over internet which relates to the claimed invention.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4057.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 571-272-4048.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703-872-9306

and / or:

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kieu D. Vu

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21